

Church Union

News and Views

Organ of the Continuation Committee
of the
South India Joint Committee on Union

Vol. IV

JULY 1933

No. 1

CONTENTS

	PAGE
DAY OF PRAYER FOR UNION, AUGUST 20, 1933	1
UNION MOVEMENTS IN GREAT BRITAIN	3
A LETTER FROM THE METROPOLITAN OF INDIA	7

THE CHRISTIAN LITERATURE SOCIETY FOR INDIA

Post Box 501, Park Town, Madras
1933

Latest Edition

PROPOSED SCHEME OF UNION

including

DRAFT BASIS OF UNION

DRAFT CONSTITUTION

and other documents

Price, 4 As.

CHURCH UNION IN SOUTH INDIA

The Story of the Negotiations

BY

THE BISHOP OF MADRAS

Price, Re. 1-8

SPECIAL INTERCESSION

AND

PRAYERS FOR UNITY

Issued by the Continuation Committee

Available in English and in Tamil

Price, Rs. 2-8-0 per 100

Christian Literature Society for India

POST BOX 501, PARK TOWN, MADRAS.

CHURCH UNION

News and Views

Editorial Board

THE BISHOP OF MADRAS, Madras.

REV. H. GULLIFORD, Coonoor.

REV. J. J. BANNINGA, D.D., Pasumalai, S. India.

(*Managing Editor.*)

Publishers : THE CHRISTIAN LITERATURE SOCIETY, PARK TOWN, MADRAS.

Vol. IV

JULY 1933

No. 1

Editorials

The Day of Prayer for Union, August 20, 1933

The Continuation Committee of the Joint Committee on Church Union in South India has designated Sunday, August 20, 1933, as a day of prayer and intercession for Church Union not only in South India, but throughout the world. The Call to Prayer is published elsewhere in this number.

Last year a very gratifying response was received to the Appeal that was sent forth by the Joint Committee and August 21, 1932 was widely observed, not only within the area of the Union but throughout the world, as a day of prayer for Church Union. Messages came not only from North India, but also from Africa, China, Japan and Australia as well as the homelands showing that people had kept that day as a day of intercession for this great cause. It is hoped that this year's date will be as generally observed, and that multitudes will intercede with the Heavenly Father for His great blessing upon this movement.

At Kodaikanal this year at public request a day of prayer was successfully observed for this cause and a member of the American Baptist Mission wrote as follows in response to the invitation to take part in this meeting :—

'Surely there is no object of intercession to which we may more confidently expect an answer than this manifest unity in Christ for which our Lord was earnestly praying that last night when He was on this earth. Our wonderful fellowship here in Him at Kodaikanal only intensifies the longing and expectation of an outer and visible unity that will satisfy and glorify Him'.

In the *Madras Diocesan Magazine* for May, the Bishop of that

Diocese writes as follows with reference to the need for intercession for this object:—

'In the difficult times in which we live there is more than ever the need for the united witness of the Church in the world. That witness is sadly weakened by our divisions, and it would be far more effective, if we could show that the real Christian truth which we stand for is strong enough to enable us to surmount our differences and to work together in the world for righteousness. There are many, no doubt, who feel that the present efforts for union and the particular schemes presented do not solve the problems. We are not asked to pray for this or that scheme. We are asked to pray that God will shew us the right way and that when we have seen the right way, we may have sufficient boldness to take it. There can be none who would seriously maintain that our present rivalries and divisions are part of God's plan and, I think, few who would claim that God has nothing more to teach us about His Church. So let us pray in all our Churches.'

The Holy Ghost—The Holy Catholic Church

A recent number of one of the British weeklies reported that Principal L. P. Jacks had delivered a sermon using the two phrases of the Apostles' Creed as his text,—‘I believe in the Holy Ghost’, ‘I believe in the Holy Catholic Church’. The report added that Dr. Jacks had stressed the point that the Holy Ghost and the Holy Catholic Church have always been closely linked throughout the period since Pentecost. Further details of the sermon are not given, but one can readily imagine how the learned preacher must have shown that it has been the great work of the Holy Ghost Himself to lead and guide the Holy Catholic Church throughout its history.

Many Christians today believe that the Holy Ghost was poured out at Pentecost and that He guided the disciples in the early days of the Church. They also believe that the Holy Ghost is a living reality today—especially in their own section of the Church. But many are not consciously aware of the fact that the Holy Spirit has been at work in the world and in the Church *from Pentecost until now* and that not in one section of the Church only but throughout the whole of the Christian Church. We may admit that no section of the Christian Church has been completely obedient to the Holy Ghost. We may admit also that the Church as a whole has never been completely obedient to the Holy Ghost. But we cannot deny that the Holy Ghost has been at work and that He has tried all along to lead the Church along the way it should go.

It can be confidently asserted that at any point in history, where there was a movement toward a deeper spiritual life or toward a more glowing service for man or toward a greater loyalty to its Lord and

Master, there the Church was guided by the Holy Spirit. It can also be safely asserted that wherever there has arisen a prophet or a saint who by his life and work has called men back to God there the Holy Spirit was at work. It is likewise true, we believe, that today in this movement for unity which is manifest in all parts of the Christian Church there is evidence that the Holy Spirit is again at work moving men's hearts toward a deeper spiritual life and toward a more loyal fulfilment of the Lord's command. All through the ages the one Holy Spirit and the one Holy Catholic Church have been linked closely together and the Holy Spirit has been able to manifest His power to the fullest degree just in proportion as the Holy Catholic Church was united and obedient to His guidance.

A Call to Christian Unity

We have great pleasure in reprinting from the *United Church Review of North India* an article by Dr. C. H. Rice of Allahabad. We believe that Dr. Rice sets forth in this article the proper spirit with reference to Church Union. He does not advocate any particular scheme nor has he a solution for all the difficulties, but he does lay down the principle that there must be union. If all Christians everywhere could accept that principle then the consummation for which we so much wish would be greatly hastened. Most people have not yet seen the need for union. They still seem to believe that Christ prefers a divided body to a united one, and that He has a special preference for their particular portion of that divided body. We must continue to pray that we all may have the same desire that Christ had, namely that His love should prevail over our individual interpretation of his teaching.

The Movement in England and Scotland

We are glad to be able to report a very definite movement toward Church Union in both England and Scotland. While the consummation of these movements is by no means close at hand the foundations are being laid on which such a structure will hereafter be raised. There are very significant aspects in both the movements for union between the Presbyterians and Congregationalists in England and in the conversations between the Church of Scotland and the Church of England. In the former case it is evident that the young people especially demand that there shall be union. They can no longer see the necessity for the differences that exist between the Presbyterian and Congregational Churches and therefore ask that these shall be one.

In Scotland the Church of that country has taken a very significant stand in asking that in the conversations between themselves and the Church of England there shall be a clear recognition of the validity of their ministry and their sacraments. The Church of Scotland would be

lacking in self-respect if it did not ask for this recognition. Its history is as honourable and as definite as that of the Church of England and whereas it adopted presbyterianism in place of episcopacy it has always maintained that its ministry and its sacraments are loyal to the unbroken line of spiritual descent from the Lord Himself. This demand on the part of the Church of Scotland will place a heavy responsibility on the Church of England. Nevertheless we cannot but believe that the Church of England will rise to the occasion and frankly admit what the majority of that Church believe in their inner hearts. Judged by the Lord's own standard, 'By their fruits ye shall know them', the Church of Scotland may be as certain of her ministry and sacraments as any Church on earth and we have no doubt that the Church of England will accept the Lord's standard in this case.

Towards Unity

In connection with the movement in England the Editor of the *Christian World*, the organ of the Congregational Church in England, printed the following editorial in the issue of May 18, 1933. The editorial shows so clearly and so keenly the differences between Congregationalism and Presbyterianism and at the same time their underlying unity that we cannot refrain from publishing it in our own organ. The union of these two Churches in England would certainly bring world union a long step nearer.

The metaphors of courtship have been playfully employed more than once in relation to the 'conversations' between representatives of the Congregational Churches and the Presbyterian Church of England. Such metaphors are perhaps a little embarrassing. They suggest an ardour on one side and a coyness on the other which do not altogether represent the facts of the situation. It would be nearer the truth to say that both these Churches are in love with the fair ideal of Christian unity, and each is desirous of serving that ideal in some practical way. There are certain differences of temperament in the two Churches, and no particular conclusion need be drawn from the fact that the Congregationalists have shown hitherto more eagerness, or less caution, in their approach to the 'practical way' of a Congregational-Presbyterian union—or alliance, or understanding, or whatever may be the outcome of conferences which have now, happily, become 'official' on both sides. The Congregational Union Assembly appointed on Tuesday of last week a committee of twelve to meet any similar committee which might be appointed by the Presbyterian Assembly. The Presbyterians two days later appointed their 'similar committee'—very graciously changing a majority vote into a unanimous one as soon as it was seen that there was a large majority in favour of conference. Nothing but good can come of 'exploring the avenues,' even

though none of the avenues should prove to be a Lovers'-lane leading to matrimony.

The Metropolitan's Explanation

We have great pleasure in publishing in this issue a letter from the Metropolitan of the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon, in which he seeks to explain the resolutions that were adopted by the Episcopal Synod of that Church in February of this year. It is gratifying to know that the Bishops in their resolutions did not intend to convey the thought that seemed to be implied to many who read their resolutions.

The difficulty with those resolutions was undoubtedly that they tried to answer a certain criticism within the Church of England and by answering that particular criticism they laid themselves open to criticism by other sections both of the Church of England and other Churches. While the action of the Episcopal Synod is only an attempt to explain things within their own Church and Fellowship it does lead to complication because others probably will not be able to accept that explanation as official or final. It is, however, a step in the right direction in that it tries to show that the Episcopal Synod did not have in view only one section of the Church in making their resolutions but that they are trying to meet the wishes of all the Churches.

A Letter from England

WETHERINGSETT RECTORY,

STOWMARKET

June 1st, 1933.

DEAR SIR,

At a meeting of the Ipswich Group of the Anglican Evangelical Group Movement the following resolution of sympathetic support of the South India Union Scheme was unanimously accepted. It was proposed by the Rev. A. Darby whose work has lain in India for some years. I was desired to send this on to you.

Yours faithfully,

W. H. LILLIE,

Clerical Secretary of the Ipswich Group.

'That this, the Ipswich Group of the A. E. G. M., believing that the movement towards the Union of the South India Churches arises from a truly Christian impulse and will conduce to a fuller recognition of the meaning of Christian life, desires to express its full sympathy with the efforts now being made to bring about such unity and prays that all obstacles may be overcome.'

1933

Day of Prayer for Church Union in South India

For fourteen years negotiations have been carried on for the union of three of the Churches in South India. A great deal of the success attending the work of the Joint Committee on Union is due to the fact that prayer has been made continually for the guidance and help of the Holy Spirit in all their deliberations. These negotiations have reached the stage where the members of these Churches should read and study the proposals made, and prayerfully consider their attitude thereto.

The Continuation Committee has appointed Sunday, August 20, as the day when in each of the local churches involved in the union times for prayer and meditation should be set apart, when in the presence of God men and women should seek to realise the purpose of God for His Church in South India, consider seriously the proposals for union, and pray that upon all the Churches a spirit of brotherhood and goodwill be poured out in rich abundance.

Thanksgiving should be offered to God for the spirit that made the members of the Joint Committee of one mind in this matter, and for the large measure of approval given by the Churches to the Scheme of Union. Let us give thanks also that in Retreats recently held there has been a drawing together of the members of the Churches, and that there is abroad a widespread desire that the divisions in the Body of Christ should cease, and that all the members become united into the one Body.

Let us pray earnestly that the same spirit of unity may be poured out upon all the members of the local churches that they may come together in the unity of the Spirit and the bond of peace. May the desire to unite in every good work become stronger, and may each member work and pray that all remaining obstacles to union may be removed, and that the way may be opened for a speedy consummation of the union so long wrought and prayed for.

Let us especially remember the home Churches that are concerned in this union, and pray that they may be led to help in every possible way the bringing to pass of this union.

A form of 'Meditation and Intercession for the Union of Christ's Church' has been prepared, with special prayers for South India, and this will be a guide to those who conduct Divine service on August 20th next. Copies in English can be had from the Christian Literature Society, Post Box No. 501, Madras.

We call upon all ministers and members of the three South India Churches to observe the day, prayerfully consider the union proposed, and work and pray for its accomplishment. We also appeal to all those who desire the union of Christ's Church to join with us in keeping the day and uniting with us in the prayer that we all may be one.

V. S. DORNAKAL,

Convener of the Church of India Delegation.

JOHN J. BANNINGA

Convener of the S.I.U.C. Delegation.

H. GULLIFORD,

Convener of the Methodist Delegation.

Copies of this Call to Prayer may be had free from the C.L.S. Post Box No. 501, Madras.

Articles

A Letter from the Metropolitan of India

BISHOP'S HOUSE,
CALCUTTA,

16th May, 1933.

MY DEAR SIR,

At a recent meeting of representatives of the Anglican, Presbyterian, Methodist and Congregationalist Churches convened by the Rev. W. Paton, it became clear in the course of discussion that Decision 7 of the Joint Meeting of our Episcopal Synod and our General Council Standing Committee held in February of this year had caused serious heart-searching in certain quarters. It was stated that this Decision had been taken by all the Free Churchmen there present to mean that in the opinion of the Episcopal Synod of our Province if a former Anglican congregation should wish an ex-S.I.U.C. or an ex-Methodist Minister to celebrate the Holy Communion even once, as for instance on the occasion of a Mission being held by such a Minister in the District, the 'Gentlemen's Agreement' would preclude the congregation from inviting him, or him from accepting such an invitation if given. Believing this to be the meaning of the Decision, they held that the Anglicans who entered the Union were not accepting as Ministers of the United Church the ex-S.I.U.C. Ministers and the ex-Methodist Ministers, in fact that there was no real union. The Free Churchmen had taken the 'Gentlemen's Agreement' as referring to the safeguarding of the consciences of those directly concerned. They had been willing to accept the position that one of these Ministers of the United Church who had been ordained in a non-Episcopal Church should not celebrate the Communion in an ex-Anglican Church, if the consciences of the congregation or even a minority of them would be thereby offended, but they were not prepared to accept the position that if the consciences of none of the members of that congregation would be offended, he must yet not celebrate in that Church, because the consciences of people elsewhere might be offended by his doing so. The interpretation thus put upon our decision was not the meaning which was in our minds when the Decision was drafted. Its purpose was to make clear what we held to be the meaning of the phrase: 'The United Church will at all times be careful not to allow any over-riding of conscience either by Church authorities or by majorities and it will not in any of its *administrative acts* knowingly transgress the long-established traditions of any of the Churches from which it has been formed'. Now interpreting this pledge in our Decision 7, we said that it meant that every honest endeavour would be made that 'to no former Anglican congregation should a non-episcopally ordained

minister *be appointed or be sent* for occasional celebrations of the Holy Communion'. Clearly the words 'appointed' or 'be sent' refer to official acts of the central administrative authority of the Church or of a Diocesan authority. They had no reference whatever to any invitation which might be extended by the congregation itself to a non-episcopally ordained minister to celebrate the Communion for them on some special occasion. We have always recognized that such occurrences which, from the long-established tradition of our Church must be regarded as irregular, would occur. I shall be grateful if you can make this statement of what was in our minds in passing the Decision widely known among those who are directly interested in this question of union in South India. I would add that I am not in this letter merely expressing my own individual view for, on hearing of the misunderstanding which had risen, I wrote round to all the members of the Episcopal Synod and the Standing Committee at present in India and every answer received has supported as correct the interpretation which I have given above.

Yours faithfully,

The Editor, *Church Union—News and Views*, FOSS CALCUTTA
Pasumalai, South India.

The Pledge and Conscience

There can be no doubt whatever that one of the gravest difficulties in connection with the drafting of the Scheme and the interpretation thereof is the almost impossible task of so drafting any sentence in that Scheme that it will mean absolutely the same thing to all persons who read it. The Committee has found this to be true over and over again in its work. Even though practically all phases of opinion are represented in the Joint Committee, after that Committee had discussed a matter thoroughly and then drafted a sentence in which they thought they had expressed their united conclusion clearly, they have over and over again found that when that sentence was read by persons who had not been present at the meeting it meant a very different thing from what they intended it should mean.

There is perhaps no part of the whole Proposed Scheme that has been open to this criticism more than the Pledge which forms such an important part of the Scheme. In the Pledge all parties to the negotiations agree that it shall not be the letter of the law but the spirit of love and fellowship that shall control the action of all who may be in official positions in the Church after union. The dominant influence in the Church after union shall be the conscientious conviction of those that enter into the Union and the pledge guarantees that the conscience of no man entering the

union shall be knowingly offended by any official act. While it is undoubtedly true that by coming into one Church, all will be laying themselves open to fellowship with men who disagree with them and to practices that are strange to them, it is also true that such persons definitely agree that they will not interfere with the conscientious beliefs of others or that they will take unnecessary offence because of their own conscientious beliefs. The Church agrees that every effort shall be made to protect the conscience of every individual. Yet it must be true also that no individual should carry a chip on his shoulder, looking for causes of offence, but should make it a part of his conscience to yield to others lest they be offended.

And this applies not only to the individual but to the congregation. It is to be expected that all who enter the union are thereby definitely laying themselves open to influences that will change their traditions, thought and practice. No man has a right to go into the union with such hide-bound convictions that he definitely asserts to everyone else that they may and must change while he will under no circumstances be subject to change. Love and fellowship mean a definite attempt to grow together, and growing together means change in all concerned.

It is undoubtedly true that the Church after union will safeguard the conscientious convictions of every member going into that Church and will compel no individual, be he a High Church Anglican or be he a Low Church Congregationalist, to attend a service or to take part in any form of worship which is contrary to his conscience. Yet the constitution of the Church may not be so framed nor may any interpretation thereof become official which definitely implies that certain individuals can under no circumstances be conceived of as changing their minds with reference to principles that they now hold fundamental. The Holy Spirit can change even such minds and there must be an opportunity for the Holy Spirit to lead wheresoever He wishes to lead this Church. Consequently no rule can be laid down which definitely prohibits a congregation from doing something that every member of that congregation wishes to do, even though it may be quite contrary to the traditions and habits of that congregation before union. While the Church is going to be definitely Episcopal there are many who hope that it will not be so exclusively episcopal that it must necessarily deny fellowship to non-episcopal Churches or individuals, and consequently though the Church will eventually be thoroughly episcopal in principle and practice, that does not mean that what is now an Episcopal congregation may not in the future be willing to receive the ministry of a man who has not been episcopally ordained. A Church may be episcopal and yet not forbid an exception to its rule. In fact it has been said that 'exceptions prove the rule' and that may be true in this case as well as others. But it must be remembered

by all going into this union that there are consciences on the Free Church side as well as on the High Church Anglican side and that *liberty* is a conscientious principle as well as *tradition*. 'Where the spirit is there is liberty' and therefore no pledge that is now given can guarantee that men who change their minds may not exercise a new found liberty even though their tradition may point in another direction. Conscience and love and fellowship must be the controlling principles.

PASUMALAI.

JOHN J. BANNINGA.

The Church of Scotland and Lambeth

Readers of *Church Union* hardly need to be reminded of the Appeal to All Christian People issued by the Lambeth Conference of 1920. It was received by many Churches with interest, and the leading non-episcopal Churches in England responded to the Appeal by appointing delegates to meet, as they did from time to time from 1921 to 1925, with delegates appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury, with a view to considering the possibility of union. When the Appeal came to the Church of Scotland and the United Free Church of Scotland its receipt was courteously acknowledged, but the reply of both Churches was that as they were fully occupied in negotiation for union with one another they were unable for the time to respond to the Appeal.

The successful issue of the negotiations in 1929 removed the difficulty that had been felt, and when the Lambeth Conference of 1930 renewed the invitation to enter into conference it was felt by many that the invitation ought to be accepted. When the Archbishop of Canterbury—himself the son of one who had been an eminent leader in the Church of Scotland—asked if he might be permitted to present the invitation in person permission was gladly given, and in a memorable speech he laid the case before the General Assembly of 1932. He made it quite clear that for a long time to come there could be no thought of organic union, but tried to show what could be done by conference to remove misunderstandings and prepare the way for co-operative action between the National Churches of England and Scotland.*

* As the position of the Church of Scotland is sometimes misunderstood it is well to state that while it is a 'national' Church in the sense of undertaking to provide religious ordinances for the whole nation, it is not an 'established' Church in the sense that the State has any control over it. The King is in no sense the head of the Church. He shows his interest in the Church of his northern realm by appointing a representative, with the title of Lord High Commissioner, to the annual meeting of the General Assembly; but his representative sits outside the house, and has absolutely no control over the proceedings of the Assembly.

Later in the day the question of accepting His Grace's invitation was considered. Able speeches in favour were made by a number of eminent leaders, but it was soon evident that widely differing views were held. To some it seemed that the time was not ripe, and that the union achieved in 1929 ought to be thoroughly cemented by several years of common living before the minds of the faithful were perplexed by any idea of wider union. Others went further and strongly deprecated any proposal to have dealings with the descendants of those who had been the persecutors of their 'Covenanting' ancestors, or with those whose Romeward trend was unmistakable. It looked as if the invitation conveyed by the Archbishop would be rejected, but a wise speech from the Principal of New College, Edinburgh (Rev. Alex. Martin, D.D.) turned the tide. At a later stage a strong committee, in the membership of which differing views were represented, was appointed, and in the course of the year two meetings with the representatives of the Anglican Communion were held.

When the General Assembly of 1933 convened it had before it a short report from its committee. With this there was a good deal of disappointment. It seemed that very little progress had been made. It had been found that the two Churches, 'as branches of the Church adhering to the Reformation' (to use the words of a statement issued by the Conference), had much in common, and means of co-operation were suggested. But when questions of intercommunion and the recognition of ministers were approached, it was obvious that there was little possibility of any agreement being reached which would satisfy the Church of Scotland. When the matter was brought before the Assembly Principal Martin and several other members of the committee did their best to show that a hopeful beginning had been made, but failed to rouse the Assembly. A motion to stop the negotiations did not receive much support, but an addition to the official motion was proposed by a venerable minister of the Church, Dr. Archibald Fleming. Having ministered for many years to a Scottish congregation in London he had had ample opportunities of coming into close contact with the Church of England, and had enjoyed the friendship of many of its leaders. But such a friendship could not blind him to the fact that all negotiations, so far as the Church of England was concerned, could only be carried on within limits, and it seemed to him that this ought to be clearly recognised by the Assembly. He accordingly proposed the following addition:—

'The General Assembly, however, desire, with a view to prevent any possible misunderstanding, that the committee should respectfully inform the representatives of the Church with which it confers that any agreement with regard to the Orders and Sacraments of the conferring Churches can only be based on the recognition of the equal validity of

the Orders and Sacraments of both Churches, and of the equal standing of the accepted communicants and ordained ministers in each'.

This proposition was supported in a vigorous speech, in which Dr. Fleming contrasted the freedom with which Anglicans were welcomed to spiritual privileges in the Church of Scotland with the very niggardly exercise of spiritual hospitality which would be the utmost which a Scottish visitor to England might expect. The attempts to show that such an addendum was superfluous were unavailing, and the Assembly adopted it, though only by a narrow majority.

It is not easy, writing at this distance, to say what the effect of this action will be. Something depends on the meaning to be attached to the resolution. So far as the Scottish representatives are concerned they have of course never doubted that their orders and membership were in every way equal to those of the Church of England, and they have doubtless been perfectly frank in stating this. But if the restriction now imposed means that before any further discussion on Orders and Sacraments takes place the Anglican members must declare that they look on Presbyterian Orders and Sacraments as of equal validity with their own, it is obvious that for this they are not ready. Apparently, therefore, the discussions at future meetings will be confined to questions of co-operation in social service, and problems like slum clearance and unemployment.

Several English papers have expressed approval of the restriction now imposed. *The British Weekly* says:—

'It is very well to say, and it is quite true, that on matters which are short of supreme importance, it is an agreeable and Christian-like thing to meet round a table, to enjoy each other's hospitality, and to get to know each other. On matters of very deepest importance, however, it is not the very highest and not the very truest form of friendliness to go on indefinitely, without ever broaching what is really the crux of the whole question between the Church of England at this moment and, on the other side the Church of Scotland and the Reformed Churches of the world.'

Another paper says:—

'The General Assembly of the Church of Scotland took a step which English Nonconformity ought perhaps to have taken some years ago. . . . Dr. Fleming commended his motion in words which had something of John Knox's downrightness in them. His addendum brings the negotiations with Lambeth into the atmosphere of cold but wholesome reality. It is a plain intimation to the Anglican authorities of the only terms on which any sort of reunion talk, whether with Scots Presbyterians or English

Free Churchmen, can have the slightest chance of a practical outcome. And it is best that Lambeth should be told the truth in plain terms'.

It may seem to Anglican readers, and perhaps to some others, that the decision is to be attributed only to Presbyterian pride. Equal terms are demanded, and since Lambeth cannot grant these it seems as if in future negotiations all vital matters must be excluded. Lambeth is debarred by its view of Orders from sanctioning general intercommunion; but might not the tension which is now felt in many places be relieved to some extent by arrangements which a little further friendly intercourse might have rendered possible? If the way to these is barred by the Anglicans' decision, the decision is surely to be regretted, even from a Presbyterian point of view. And may a Presbyterian be pardoned for saying that the restriction under which future conversations are to be conducted deprives the bishops of much benefit which they might have received from further intercourse with a group of men whose great learning in all Church matters entitled them to speak with authority?

Be this as it may, the decision of the Scottish Assembly will do good if it leads those who stand in the Lambeth position to realise how strong is the feeling in other branches of Christ's Church that along the lines of Lambeth no organic union can ever be achieved. One of the most important questions which the Lambeth Conference of 1930 had to decide was whether intercommunion was a step towards union or a sign of its consummation. To the great regret of members of other Churches the Conference chose the latter alternative. When an eminent and learned Anglo-Catholic was asked if he knew of a case in which union had come before intercommunion he had to go back to the healing of the Arian schism for an instance. On the other side instance after instance can easily be produced. Who can imagine that the Scottish union of 1929, or the Methodist union of 1932, could ever have taken place if one of the negotiating Churches had said, 'We regret that until organic union has taken place we do not see our way to meet you at the Table of our common Lord, unless under certain clearly defined conditions, for we regard your orders as lacking something vital'? If the proposed union in South India is brought about it will be an exception; but the exception is allowed by the Free Churches only on the understanding that after union the freedom which they now enjoy is to be in no way curtailed, but rather increased.

Those who have enjoyed the privilege which membership of our Joint Committee has brought are able to some extent to enter into the attitude of mind which forced the bishops at Lambeth to this view of the relative position of union and intercommunion. The bishops, many of them with deep regret at the separation which it involves, have definitely adopted

the view that to sanction intercommunion before union would not be the best way to union in the long run. Many of us have learned to respect their conviction and refrain from all censorious judgment. But we find it exceedingly difficult to persuade the Churches to which we belong to be equally understanding. Since the refusal of intercommunion leads in countless cases to local disunion it seems to them that the denial of the right is a denial of the fundamental principle of Christian brotherhood. Will not our Anglican friends realise that it is at least possible that this and not Presbyterian pride is at the root of our determination not to narrow by any restrictions on intercommunion the liberty we now enjoy?

J. H. MACLEAN

A Call to Christian Unity

By Dr. C. H. RICE

(From 'The United Church Review')

I. Our Lord founded a United Fellowship. In a united fellowship Christianity was begun. St. Paul entered into the fellowship and laboured to develop it. Jesus had worked and prayed for an intimate unity amongst his followers :—

'That they all may be one;
as Thou, Father, art in me, and I in Thee,
that they also may be one in Us.
That the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me.'

The oneness which Jesus fostered in the earliest Christian group, and for which he prayed, was a foretaste, a witness, an evidence of oneness, of identification with the Father.

II. The Church began in a *United Fellowship*, but that single simple fellowship developed down through the Christian centuries, into a diversity of Churches. These were historical divisions on national lines, or sequent upon political events, or recognizing types of human temperament, or based on differences of doctrine or of emphasis. In their time they made significant contribution to the Faith, protesting against some great error, conserving some great value, witnessing to some great truth, or, in some age of complacency, blazing out in passionate zeal.

But now these Churches, become sects, have split and multiplied beyond bounds and beyond reason. In India alone there are more than a hundred different varieties of Protestant Christians. I will not dwell

upon the scandal of sectarianism, but surely most of these divisions—many even of the major divisions are outgrown. They are largely meaningless. And we still suffer from them. Habit and inertia keep us wedded to them. And especially in those parts of the world where the Christian Church has recently come, how peculiarly alien are the reasons for our division, and how alien the mental habits they represent! From division we suffer competition and waste; from division we learn pride and suspicion; by division our Christianity is weakened—made partial and fragmentary. Thus the Body of Christ is wounded and broken!

III. Away from this division we are called again to unity. We are called to unity by a Gospel that is fundamentally one. We agree upon all the great fundamental truths of our Faith: God; Jesus Christ our Lord and Saviour; the inspired Scriptures; Faith; Baptism; Salvation. Our Gospel is one, and the need for it one and the same everywhere.

We are called to unity by the fundamental need of the world. A partial Christianity—a fragmented Christianity, is not good enough. The world needs the whole truth of God. The world needs brotherhood in God's unbroken family.

We are called to unity by an enlarged sense of human brotherhood—brotherhood as a fact in the world, and as a necessity to the world. In these days we must get together with our fellowmen. We must think together—we must live together with them. We must share world purposes with them. And in our Christian solidarity we recognize that our Christian heritage is common. We are all heirs together of these Christian Ages which have gone before.

We are called to unity by a common task. It is a single task! How great a task! To proclaim our Faith; to persuade the world, and change the world, is too great a work for a broken instrument! And this call of the common task is a practical call—a protest against duplication and loss and ineffectiveness.

We are called to unity by the meaning of the Atonement itself. Christ would make us at one with God the Father, but He finds us at variance with each other. This is civil war in God's family. This is a denial, a negation of the meaning of our Gospel. It needs a united faith, a united voice in the world to proclaim the great spiritual truth and reality of the Atonement. A Gospel powerful enough to unite us will demonstrate atoning power before the world!

IV. The call to unity does not fall upon unfamiliar ears. We are already learning unity. This service is a glorious experience of united fellowship. We have many such. We have learned to unite in common worship and in seasons of prayer. These great Christian hymns belong

to us all. I confidently expect that before the year is out we shall be hearing the Easter or the Christmas message of our Faith sung by all the choirs of this city massed together in one place. The wealth and beauty of a hundred books of prayer, of devotion, of interpretation are our common possession. Our symbols, our festivals are the same.

We are hearing this month the inspiring story of the Mission of Fellowship in which the Indian Churches represented by members of four communions conveyed to the older Churches of Great Britain and Ireland a beautiful expression of identification. In a very real sense it is true that as we have just sung: 'We are not divided—all one body we'. To-night we are One in Him.

We are not only learning Unity through Fellowship but also through work. We are learning to work together. Call to witness the score of Churches and Missions which in this province comprise the United Provinces' Christian Council, and the many more joined together in the National Christian Council. There is hardly a large city in India to-day in which you will not find a union hospital or college or divinity school or training institution in which various Churches are joined in co-operation. Four times we have recently sat in the Central Board directing the policy and development of the forty Christian colleges in India, in which twenty different Church societies are working. Since 1910 principles of unity and co-operation have governed almost all the Christian Societies working in India, enabling them to occupy the territory without duplication and overlapping. There are now two great United Churches in the North and South of India, in which the organic union of several large bodies of Christians has already taken place; not to speak of the great and successful experiments in unity in Canada and other countries. The Pastors' Association of this city, which has conceived and arranged this service, is a near example of a working fellowship.

V. We thus face the future with conviction and experience behind us. It is well to be careful and patient. But possessing this conviction and experience, we must press on together without delay to build the Church of the Future, in which we shall join. And what is to be our attitude and method in this wonderful task? Must we try to eliminate all the things in which we differ? Must we think of a bare, abstract union on the basis of those points in which we are already identical?

No, we must come bearing gifts. We must bring the wealth of all our kingdoms to lay at His feet. What noble contributions the various branches of the Church have to offer! What righteous causes they have stood for! How they have upheld liberty; what treasures of devotion; what zeal; what contribution to human life, to education, to philanthropy; what experience of order and discipline! These are the gifts we bear.

The wise Kings who came bearing gifts, did not come to plead the cause of small kingdoms; did not come to shut each other out of light and glory; did not come to claim monopoly of merit or of privilege. They came bearing the treasures of all their kingdoms, with one holy passion, upon one single quest, following one star—bowing down to One Lord.

'Blow, wind of God, and set us free
From hate and want of charity;
Strip off the trappings of our pride,
And drive us to our Brothers' side.

'Shine, light of God, upon our face;
Kindle our hearts with beams of grace;
Beneath the gladness of thy sun,
Our life with all mankind is one.

'Fair world of God, whose teeming soil
With harvest's boon repays our toil,
May thy rich fulness forth declare
Thy maker's universal care.

'Speak, Son of God. Thy Father's heart;
Teach, Son of Man, the brother's part,
Till earth shall be, like heaven above,
One holy family of love.'

Protestant Catholicism

There is a tendency nowadays, in certain quarters, to disparage the word 'Protestant'. People seem to have got hold of the idea that it is a negative word. It is quite common to hear Christendom spoken of as though it were divided into two camps, namely 'Catholic' and 'Protestant', the 'Protestants' being those who protest against the supposed dignities of the 'Catholics'. This is really an utter travesty of the meaning of both words. In the first place the word 'Protestant', far from being negative, is highly positive in meaning. In the language of Shakespeare a Protestant is one who affirms in the teeth of a denial. When Robert Herrick, hymning his beloved Anthea, writes:—

'Bid me to live, and I will live
Thy Protestant to be; . . .'

he claims that he will be her upholder and champion in the face of all comers. Surely nothing could be more positive than this.

When our Fathers of the Reformation called themselves Protestant, they were not so much concerned with what they protested against, as with what they protested. They were protesting once again the truth of the Gospel in its fulness, and reaffirming great positive principles which had long been forgotten. They asserted the boundless nature of God's saving grace, untrammelled by man-made institutions, and upheld the right of every living soul freely to dwell in joyous fellowship with the Father apart from any mediating power save the precious blood of the Redeemer.

It is high time that we, ourselves, return to this meaning of the word 'Protestant', and refuse to allow it to be spoilt by those who would twist it to serve their own ends. A Christian must needs be a Protestant or he is no longer fit to bear the name of Christ. He must protest the truth he has found in his Lord, the freedom he has gained in His service, and the fulness of the love of God which has sought him out and redeemed him from bondage. He will also protest his own Catholicity, in that he would make his own the truth that has been found in Christ by the whole of Christendom, throughout all ages.

Christendom, therefore, may not be divided into 'Protestant' and 'Catholic', for all true Christianity is Protestant Catholicism. That is to say, it claims for itself the truth revealed throughout the Church Universal, and protests that truth to all who would deny any part of it. Anyone who will not accept the implications of both words in their proper sense cannot be fully Christian. He who would be a 'Catholic' without being a Protestant will lose the fire of the Gospel and become an Institutionalists. He who would be a 'Protestant' without regard to his Catholic heritage will lose the fulness of the knowledge of Christ, and will become a Sectarian.

There are those who have tried to keep the name of 'Catholic' for themselves alone. Too often their fault has been, not that they are Catholic, but that they are insufficiently Catholic, and, above all, that their Catholicism is not 'Protestant'. Can we not, therefore, take to ourselves once again both these great words, so deeply rooted in Christian history, and strive to make our own Christianity more akin to a real Protestant Catholicism?

R. G. BLISS

COIMBATORE.

Presbyterians and Congregationalists

Conferences on Union to Proceed Officially

(From 'The Christian World', London)

And then Thursday morning : a crowded House and everybody expectant of a full-dress debate on the proposed 'Presbygational' rapprochement. Two motions were before the Assembly. The first, moved by Dr. S. W. Carruthers, rejoiced in the occasions for co-operation already existing between all parts of the Church of Christ, and urged that the more intensive and extensive use of these occasions 'will have a greater practical effect in promoting Christian unity than can possibly be produced at the present time by the holding of conferences to talk over the possibilities of a closer union.' As Dr. Carruthers spoke to this motion one was conscious of how much it was prompted by a broad brotherly spirit and a deep concern lest a step taken at the present time should prove afterwards to be a hindrance. The second resolution, moved by Dr. Carnegie Simpson, seconded by Rev. James Reid and ultimately carried, was as follows :—

The Assembly, having had brought before it the question of closer relationship with the Congregational Union, and the same question having been brought before last Assembly, recognizes that, for the guidance of the Church's opinion in the matter, and, also, in friendly response to the readiness expressed by the sister Church to confer upon it, the subject should now receive further and more authorized consideration.

The Assembly, therefore, while in no way committing itself to any decision or opinion as to the duty or feasibility of union between Congregationalism and Presbytery in England, appoints a committee, to consist of twelve members, with instructions to survey the question in its various bearings, including its bearing on the relationship of this Church to other branches of the Presbyterian family, and with power to confer, as may be found desirable, with any similar committee appointed by the Congregational Union; and to report to next Assembly.

*

*

*

*

*

Dr. Simpson made it clear that his was not a motion for union but for exploration. There was a strong current of feeling in the Church, especially among the younger people, in the direction of such conversations as the motion suggested, and it was the duty of the Assembly to take hold of the situation and see that it was wisely handled. To take no action would not put an end to the matter, but might rather make things

more difficult later on. 'It is not my idea of Assembly leadership to let this go on uncontrolled.'

* * * * *

The debate which followed was of a high order, devoid of all bitterness but with intense feeling, lightened here and there by glints of humour to which the House responded heartily. When the voting took place there were in favour of Dr. Carruthers's motion 89, and in favour of Dr. Simpson's 318. Then occurred something very typical of our Assembly, as also of the men who had fought so sincerely against the step decided upon. When Dr. Simpson's motion was put to the House as the substantive motion, Dr. Carruthers sprang to his feet and appealed to his supporters to vote for the measure in order to make it unanimous, in view of the fact that no question of principle was involved. To this the House rose solidly and the motion was declared to be carried unanimously.

* * * * *

Among the memories of Assembly with which the members dispersed on the following day not the least vivid was that of the spirit of that debate.

Friends of Reunion

The Inauguration at High Leigh

(From 'The Guardian', London, May 26, 1933)

'That they all may be one, even as Thou, Father, art in Me and I in Thee . . . that the world may believe.' One organically united Church as the instrument of the one God's redemptive purpose for the world: that is the vision of the Friends of Reunion. But they see also that to co-operate effectively with God's will for unity you must break up the problem of reunion into manageable bits. And so, while keeping the wide vision of the Lausanne Movement, they propose to devote particular attention to home reunion between the Anglican and Free Churches, as part of the larger problem of world reunion.

The Friends of Reunion came into being at a representative conference of Anglican and Free Church ministers and laymen and women, held at High Leigh on Monday and Tuesday in last week under the chairmanship of the Bishop of Coventry. Invitations had been sent to representative people in England, Scotland, Ireland, and Wales. Many distinguished leaders, prevented by unavoidable engagements from attending, sent cordial letters of sympathy, but the conference was helped by the presence of the

Bishops of Croydon, Dover and Warrington, the Dean of York, the Archdeacons of Lewes and Monmouth, Canon Guy Rogers, Dr. Tissington Tatlow, Father Hebert (S.S.M.), Dr. Findlay, Dr. Lewis Robertson, the Revs. F. Ballard, George Barclay and W. Paton, Professor Dodd, Lady Proctor, Miss Ruth Rouse and Miss Zoe Fairfield. There were also present a good number of parochial clergy and ministers holding charges in large centres.

The chief speakers were the Bishop of Coventry, the Rev. Hugh Martin, Professor C. H. Dodd, Dr. Tissington Tatlow, the Archdeacon of Monmouth and the Rev. James Reid. Devotional services were conducted by the Bishop of Croydon, the Rev. E. W. Thompson (Methodist) and in the absence, through indisposition, of the Master of The Temple, by the Bishop of Dover. The Bishop of Coventry was elected chairman of the Friends of Reunion, and the Rev. James Reid (Congregationalist), of Eastbourne, as chairman of the executive; the joint honorary secretaries are the Rev. S. C. Carpenter (Master of The Temple) and the Rev. Hugh Martin. There is a large and representative council, which has power to co-opt.

INSPIRATION FROM LAUSANNE

The Friends of Reunion take their inspiration from the Lausanne Movement, with which many members of the new society have been associated. But it is a free and unofficial group of people who, while they envisage the one great world-wide Catholic Church that is to be, wish, as a practical step towards the big ideal of world reunion, to press forward in support of all such steps towards home reunion between the Anglican and Free Churches as can be taken at the present time. It is known that these steps are being again carefully considered in official conferences between Anglican and Free Church leaders. The Friends of Reunion aim at creating an atmosphere which may help the non-official discussions.

AWAKENING THE RANK AND FILE

Those at the conference caught a vision which they wish to share with others. They long to stir the apathy due to lack of knowledge on the part of the rank and file of all the Churches. They hope to give driving force to quicken the pace of reunion by getting together groups of people in every locality who will try to inform themselves better as to the progress of the reunion movement in recent years, and help to make known what has been accomplished and is being accomplished by the movements which take their name from Lausanne, Stockholm and South India. They will try also to understand better the worship, history, faith and doctrine of Communions other than their own. This greater

knowledge and understanding must issue in much more persistent and believing prayer for reunion, and in any common enterprise, such as joint evangelism, and joint councils of Christian congregations, as may prove possible for members of different denominations.

All at the conference felt that there is a great volume of goodwill and a conspicuous agreement on the fundamentals of the faith. Cannot we, then, quicken the pace of the movement towards organic home reunion as part of the world movement towards unity and the one Church, organically united, which is certainly the will of God and part of His redemptive plan? The Churches in the mission field are waiting on the home Church; the world desperately needs the witness of a united Church. All, both young and old (and the movement wants the help of the young), who are prepared to see the vision and to work and pray for its accomplishment as time and strength permit, will be welcomed as members. Money will be needed if the Friends of Reunion are to do effective work, but still more necessary is the spirit of believing prayer. Applications for membership should be sent to the Secretary, Friends of Reunion, 'Annamdale', North End Road, London, N. W. 11. The minimum subscription is a shilling.

Church Union Literature

We believe that a greater interest in the Scheme for Church Union in South India is growing among the Churches. Meetings of various kinds where it is discussed and even the production of an alternative plan show the interest that is being awakened. Those who wish to understand what is proposed should read the literature that is available. A careful study of this is essential to a proper understanding of the situation.

The first thing is to study the *Proposed Scheme of Union* itself. The third and the latest edition in English sets forth first the 'Basis of Union'; then comes in detail the 'Constitution of the Church of South India'; followed by 'The Inauguration of the Union' and 'Proposed Procedure for the Establishment of the Dioceses of the United Church'. The Scheme has been translated into Tamil, Telugu, Malayalam and Kanarese, so that those not familiar with English may read it in their own tongue.

Some parts of the Scheme may not be easily understood by those not familiar with Church organization, and explanations of the Scheme have been published in Tamil and Telugu. Probably a great deal more of explanation is necessary to bring home to the village Christian the

purpose of the Scheme. This probably will best be done orally to the village congregation by those who are familiar with the Scheme.

To make clear what the Joint Committee has done there has recently been published in English a pamphlet entitled *The History of the Church Union Movement in South India*. This sketches very briefly the origin of the movement in 1919 and the successive steps that have been taken by the representatives of the three Churches to understand one another's position and to provide ways and means by which all could agree to come together. This brief history will be very valuable to those who wish to know how agreement has been reached upon many very difficult problems. The pamphlet has been published for free distribution. It should be read along with the scheme, for on many points it elucidates it.

The Joint Committee believes that the Holy Spirit has guided it in the formulation of the Scheme in answer to much widespread prayer. The bringing of the Scheme to fulfilment will demand from the members of the Churches much thought and above all much prayer. It is not in an atmosphere of discussion that Christian unity will be achieved, though discussion is necessary, but in an atmosphere of devotion. It is in worship and prayer that Christians realise their oneness in Jesus Christ. To encourage and develop the spirit of devotion there has been published in English *Meditation and Intercession for the Union of Christ's Church*. There are Scripture readings to encourage meditation on the Church of God with suitable prayers. There is a *A Special Intercession for the Union of Christ's Church*, together with special prayers for South India. This pamphlet should be of special value to pastors of South India Churches, and parts of it can profitably be used every Sabbath Day in public worship. It is hoped to have these translated into the vernaculars, if funds permit. The time has come when in all the local churches that are contemplating union special prayers for the guidance and help of the Holy Spirit should be offered. In this pamphlet suitable prayers will be found. They will be specially helpful for the Day of Prayer, which has been fixed this year for August 20th. In prayer and worship the minds of the people will be directed to the subject of union, and it will be in a spirit of devotion that the members of God's Church will be guided by His Spirit to come together and be visibly one Church.

Many books and pamphlets have been published during the last few years on the question of Church Unity. Many of them have been written from a party standpoint, but it is well for us to try to understand the position of those who are opposed to us. The Bishop of Madras has written a helpful book entitled *The Story of the Negotiations*. To those who wish to study the question in its wider aspects we recommend a

study of Faith and Order: *Proceedings of the World Conference, Lausanne, 1927*; the volume on *International Missionary Co-operation in the Report of the Jerusalem Meeting of the International Missionary Council*; and a book entitled *The Call for Christian Unity: the Challenge of a World Situation*, written by Liberal Evangelicals of the Church of England.

The Joint Committee hopes to publish other pamphlets dealing with various aspects of the South India Union Scheme, so that the members of the Churches may be instructed fully in what is involved in the union.

All the pamphlets referred to can be had at the Depot of the Christian Literature Society, Post Box 501, Park Town, Madras.

Alternative Scheme of Church Union

Will it Unite the Present Churches?

(By Courtesy of the 'Madras Mail')

Some Difficulties Examined

The Rev. J. J. Banninga, D.D., Secretary of the Joint Committee on Union, writes:

In the *Madras Mail* of June 21, Mr. D. M. Devasagayam of the Bangalore Conference Continuation Group presented the draft of an Alternative Scheme of Church Union. At the meeting of the Continuation Group which was held in Palamcottah in 1932, a Sub-Committee with Mr. Devasagayam as Chairman was appointed to draft such a scheme and this evidently is the report of that Committee. This scheme was presented to the Continuation Group in Trivandrum during the past week. Evidently the discussion at the meeting would lead one to feel that the Group were not very friendly to this 'alternative scheme' and they seemed to think it would not provide a means of union between the present Churches. It was referred to a committee 'for further study'.

That this alternative scheme has been carefully thought out is perfectly evident throughout its every paragraph. It is also evident that the drafter of the scheme is desirous that all Christians should be united in one body, and that certainly is a great gain for the Church Union Movement. There are still too many people in the world who seem to believe that Christ prefers a divided body with rival interpretations of Christianity. It is certainly well that the members of the Continuation Group should

accept the principle that there should be one Church, though within that Church there might be a great deal of variety. An essential of union is that all Christians should accept the membership, ministry and sacraments of all other Christians and if the alternative scheme were accepted that undoubtedly would be the result.

'SUITABLE TO INDIAN RELIGIOUS GENIUS'

It is stated that the alternative scheme is a 'reconstruction of the Indian Church on lines suitable to the Indian religious genius and to the simplicity of the Gospel'. It is evident from a study of the scheme that the simplicity of the Gospel certainly has been aimed at. It is true that there is rather a lengthy creed which all are supposed to accept. It is also true that this creed is distinctly trinitarian and that, therefore, probably some modern Christians could not accept that creed. The practical interpretation of the creed, however, puts an emphasis upon the humble daily life in fellowship with Christ. It certainly is most commendable. In most respects certainly this creed is thoroughly orthodox.

Perhaps if one were judging the scheme by the twofold purpose stated above one would not find in it the Indian influence in as full a measure as one would desire. There is no indication in the scheme at all, as far as I can see, which links the scheme with Indian traditions. Except for the paragraph on the 'Training of the Ministry', no Indian terminology is used. There one does find a mention of the 'ashram' which is linked with brotherhoods in a way that hardly implies that the fundamental conception is Indian rather than Western. The rest of the scheme seems to be merely an acceptance of Western Congregationalism with a few minor changes which introduce practices from the present South India United Church and the London Missionary Society rather than accepting either the simplicity of the Apostolic days or the Indian traditions of the twentieth century.

THE TRUE TRADITION

One cannot help but recall the series of articles which Mr. K. T. Paul, of revered memory, published in the *Young Men of India* a few years ago. He there showed what was the true Indian tradition with reference to religious organizations and movements and showed in particular how Indian temples and mutts were controlled. What he there showed to be true of Indian organizations certainly differs very radically from the alternative scheme now proposed.

What the scheme seems to do is to lay down the thought of its author of a very simple form of Christianity such as might perhaps be found in the early chapters of the Acts of Apostles when the early Christians were still labouring very decidedly under the influence of the

doctrine of the second coming of Christ. It is true, however, that this alternative scheme does not provide for any officers in the Church like the apostles who were manifestly in control of the Church in those early days. We do not find in Acts any formal system of Church government, but the apostles were practically the government of the Church and they exercised that government by appointing other leaders, by preaching and administering the Sacraments, by disciplining and even excommunicating members, and by leading in the work of expanding the Kingdom. Hence they did practically all that any modern Church organization does. The alternative scheme retains something of the simplicity of those days, but makes no substitute for this organisation.

The alternative scheme, of course, does not pretend to try to provide an organisation which will unite the present Churches. The author distinctly says that his scheme is 'a reconstruction of the Indian Church on lines suitable to Indian religious genius and to the simplicity of the Gospel'. Therefore he does not ask the Syrian Christian, nor the Anglican, nor the Lutheran, nor the Presbyterian, what he thinks is essential to the Church to-day, but he himself formulates a simple organisation on the basis of his own congregational experience and asks all others to accept that. What was said by Mr. P. K. Matthew, a representative of the Jacobite Syrian Church, at the meetings in Travancore a few days ago, amply indicates that the Jacobites could not accept this simple scheme for they are not even prepared to accept the Proposed Scheme of Union which includes episcopacy. Hence the alternative scheme while it may be a reconstruction of Christianity can hardly be called a scheme for the union of the present divided Churches.

AN UNREGAINED SIMPLICITY

It is undoubtedly true that there was a simplicity in the Early Church that has not been found since then. But to those who have studied the history of the Church it is evident that that simplicity was due to two things. First of all to the smallness of the number of Christians and the adequate control that the apostles exercised over them and in the second place it was due to the expectation of the speedy return of Christ. Hence no organisation was necessary. There were then no church buildings, but Christians met in homes. Until the deacons were appointed there were no officers of any kind that had been elected. As new congregations were organised in new places the same simplicity remained as long as the apostles were in control. Nevertheless, to those who believe that the gift of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost was an abiding reality there can be no hesitation in accepting the guidance of the Holy Spirit not only for the first few chapters of the Acts of Apostles but for the

whole of the history of the Christian Church. As Principal L. P. Jacks has shown in a recent sermon, the two statements in the Apostles' Creed, namely, 'I believe in the Holy Ghost' and 'I believe in the Holy Catholic Church' are undoubtedly bound together, because throughout all the ages it was the Holy Spirit that was guiding and directing the affairs of the Holy Catholic Church. Hence the period up to the year 70 not only but the period 70-150 was also under the control of the Holy Spirit, and when the Church emerges after the year 150 we find it fighting for its very life with schism within and heresy outside the Church. But we find the Holy Spirit still leading and He continued to lead the Church not only in the formation of its creeds and in its preparation of the canon of the Holy Scriptures, but also in the development of the organisation of the Church. We cannot, of course, say that everything the Church did was in accordance with the Holy Spirit for if that had been true there would not have been these divisions. But nevertheless the Holy Spirit was never withdrawn from the Church and He is even to-day working within the Holy Catholic Church striving especially that it may become one again in order that the world may know that the Father sent His son into the world. Hence any scheme drawn up today for union must begin with the Churches as they exist and try to bring them together on some basis that will be acceptable to them all. This is a great task,—much more difficult than to reconstruct one's conception of the Church along any particular line for it means that one must be so clear in his own thinking that he will be able to persuade others also to accept the proposals that he is making.

PALPABLE INFLUENCES

If one reads this alternative scheme carefully he cannot help but see the influence of the L. M. S. and the Travancore Church written large throughout the whole document. Not only is the terminology theirs, as clearly seen by such terms as 'Fully independent churches', 'semi-independent churches', 'circles', 'district association', 'Church Council', etc., but also the attitude taken toward the sacraments and other aspects of Church life. It is true that the Travancore Church has always been thoroughly orthodox in its attitude toward the sacrament. But in the alternative scheme the extreme independent position, modified slightly by a Quaker attitude, has been inserted in such a way that certainly no Syrian or Anglican or Lutheran could possibly accept the conclusions. It is barely possible that a Jacobite or a High Church Anglican might accept 'Baptism as a symbol of regeneration'. That phrase certainly is not Congregational and has slipped in probably by mistake. Nor is the sacrament of the Lord's Supper defined in such a way that even Congregationalists would be able to accept it. It is suggested that it will

be 'necessary to warn unworthy participants', but no hint is given as to who is to give this warning or who is to have authority to debar persons from participation. It is stated that the sacrament is a 'solemn and sacred matter between the believer and the Lord.' If that position is logically retained, no one would have a right to forbid any other person to partake of the Lord's Supper no matter how unworthy he might consider him. This at once raises the whole question as to whether the Church is to be a body of absolutely independent members who may do as they please or whether there is to be a consensus of opinion within the Church in accordance with which the members of the Church must live. If there is to be a consensus of opinion there must be discipline and if there is to be discipline there must be officers who exercise it, and one is driven at once to some form of government no matter how simple it may be. It is hard to conceive of a *group* of people each one of whom is absolutely independent in his thought and life and action. Such a group could hardly be called a Church, for they are not one body. They are grains of sand that happened to be contained in one vessel at one time, but they have no internal union.

EMPHASIS UPON INDIVIDUALITY

Throughout the document this emphasis upon the individuality of the members is brought out very prominently. One wonders how any person can become a member of such a group except by simply expressing his desire to do so. There evidently is no authority to exclude him if he wishes to come in. It is said that everything must be done according to the will of God, but isn't the knowledge of the will of God one of the great difficulties that now separates us? The Lutherans claim that they know the will of God, as do the Syrians, Anglicans, and the Congregationalists. Who is to determine what the will of God is? If each man is to determine it for himself then where is going to be the unity? For instance, the scheme says 'All adult earning members may be *required* to make *voluntary* contributions toward the support of the Church'. The italics are mine. But when one sees the word 'required' and 'voluntary' thus brought closely together one sees the weakness of this whole scheme. It is to be a voluntary organization and yet these volunteers are to be required to do certain things. It is frankly admitted that in order to have any kind of group there must be certain requirements and consequently if a man is a member of that group, he must be required to do these things, but if he refuses to do them what is to happen? Persuasion may be a very fine way of doing our work here in this world, but when one accepts certain privileges and certain opportunities, one must also accept certain responsibilities and consequently obedience to others is a quality that cannot altogether be ignored even in the loosest kind of a fellowship.

Likewise we are told 'the roll of active membership shall be revised from time to time'. By whom? It will make a big difference whether I revise the roll or whether the person who differs from me revises the roll. Shall the majority do it, or shall the minority do it? That question alone would be enough to disrupt an organization that came together only on this voluntary basis.

THE SCHEME FOR THE MINISTRY

The rather extensive rules in the scheme for the ministry are intensely interesting. There is evidently an attempt to maintain a ministry and yet at the same time there is also the attempt to keep that ministry within the general body of Church membership. Evidently the layman who wrote this document has not always seen eye to eye with the ministry of the present Churches and feels that they are taking airs to themselves in ways that are not warranted. It is unfortunately true that both laymen and ministers have been guilty of assuming authority, physical, intellectual, or financial and have undoubtedly dominated the Christian Church too much in the past. Not infrequently the man with the loudest voice controls an assembly, or the man with the longest purse, or even the man who can offer the longest prayer and therefore poses as a man of piety. On the whole, however, if one regards the history of the Church impartially it must be recognised that the ministry has been the working force of the Church and has kept the Church alive and growing. There are exceptions, of course, to all rules and the exceptions work both ways in connexion with this rule. Many ministers are not what they ought to be, whereas many laymen have worked far beyond what many ministers have done. Nevertheless the ministers are still the active working force in the Church. The proviso with reference to the ministry that they should be treated with dignity and honour, but that they should not exercise any voting power reminds one of the prayer of the Negro layman in America who was an elder in a Church that had just called a new pastor. They had not promised him a very large salary and there was some doubt even as to whether that could be paid or not. But the elder prayed 'Oh Lord, when our pastor comes to us do thou keep him humble. We will keep him poor.' Something of that kind will evidently be the fate of the ministers of this Church, for it is evident that they will be regarded with such suspicion and fear lest they become dominating forces in the community that everything will be done to keep them humble and poor.

THE LORD'S SUPPER

There is one interesting item with reference to the Lord's Supper where it is said 'that the element of the Lord's Supper may be altered to suit Indian conditions and sentiments'. One wonders whether the choice

of the present elements was the result of an attempt to suit the sentiments of the Early Church or whether they were elements chosen by the Lord Himself, symbolic of definite meaning. If so, may local conditions and sentiments today change either the elements or the symbols or the meaning back of the symbols? After all if things mean something the question arises as to whether you can change the things without changing the meaning. Would it not be better to try to remain loyal to what we believe the Lord has chosen?

Another little inconsistency in the alternative scheme is the statement that a Church Council may make arrangements 'to check and audit the accounts of all the churches and institutions'. To audit accounts means to have authority. When Government audits the accounts of the schools or other institutions, it means that Government has certain authority over those schools and can direct the use of the money and its expenditure. Hence if a Church Council may audit accounts, that Church Council evidently is to have authority also over the local churches and the institutions within its area. This does not mean either that the Churches will be independent or that their work will be voluntary. They will have to obey the rules of the Church Council and hence will not be independent. The same applies to the management of their properties. If the Property Committee is going to keep a list of the properties, and watch over the welfare and management of the properties, it is going to assume authority which will in the end be more dominating than that of even the bishops in some churches today. No form of control can be more irksome than that exercised through finance and property and evidently in this alternative scheme there are going to be both Finance and Property Committees that will have such control.

ROOM FOR DISSENTING CHURCHES

It is true that an attempt is made to give to dissenting Churches and those who do not accept the ruling of the Church Council an opportunity to continue in fellowship and that all attempts at fellowship are to be along the line of persuasion and not by compulsion. However, if the Church Council is 'competent to make observations or revise their decisions' the local churches are sure to resent the work of the Church Council and that cannot make for union or unity.

It is thus evident that while the alternative scheme is an attempt to try to produce a Church modelled after New Testament simplicity and modern Congregational organization it can hardly be called an attempt to unite existing Churches. While it might conceivably be desirable that all Christians, including the Roman Catholics, should give up their conceptions with reference to doctrine, organization, ministry and sacraments and come back to a very simple personal belief in Jesus Christ as Saviour,

without any formal organization, many good qualities in the present organizations would undoubtedly be lost. There would be no authority to exercise discipline or lead men into a higher moral life. There would be no arrangements for the adequate maintenance of Church work. There would be no organization to extend the work of the Church into parts not yet touched. There would be no continuity of influence from one generation to another. Hence there would be no stability in the work of that Church. What we do need is that quality of this alternative scheme which seeks to make each one love his neighbour as himself and seek his purposes at all times by love and not by coercion. If that spirit could prevail everywhere we undoubtedly would come nearer together and it is for that spirit we must strive. But if we have that spirit, almost any form of organization will do. It does not matter much in this world whether we have a benevolent autocracy or a wise aristocracy or a united democracy. In all these cases the affairs of the State would be managed for the whole of the State. It is only when selfish narrowness comes in, whether it be into the mind of a monarch, or into the group of aristocrats, or whether it be into the mind of the mass, where selfishness and pride dominate, that there comes division and disharmony. Hence we should all pray and work that there may be love and unselfishness and loyalty to Jesus Christ and then we will soon find the organization in which we can all unite.

What Chance for Union?

By Dr. JAMES BLACK, Edinburgh

From 'The British Weekly', January 6, 1933

What impresses an outsider most of all in his first survey of the Christian Church? Undoubtedly its obvious divisions, sects and denominations. To a stranger the Church must seem as parti-coloured as a patchwork quilt. A Chinaman or an Indian, for instance, must be amazed and puzzled by our opposed and sometimes unbrotherly parties, and must wonder whether we are all followers of the same Christ. Is there one Church or ten?

In the same way, among ourselves, non-Church people often remark, 'When you Christians settle your internal differences, I shall think of joining you.' Such a criticism may be wholly genuine—though, as often as not, it is a kind of defensive apology for being outside something admittedly good and challenging.

Are our differences a scandal? Is there really such a thing as the 'sin of schism'?

If I may confess it, the sects and divisions of the Church seldom trouble me. They are as natural as the disparities of human thinking. They trouble me no more than do the dozens of divisions among our political parties. However desirable social and political unity may be, I cannot help recognising that these political parties are only a final proof that our people are still thinking, dreaming and caring. So long as they keep thinking and caring enough, there are bound to be diverse parties. I could quite easily make one general political organisation in our land to-morrow—If only I could stop the nation from thinking and caring! The easiest road to unity is by indifference.

In regard to Church divisions, people are apt to forget that even before God gave us Jesus, He gave us brains—and expects us to use them. He expects us to use them even in understanding Jesus. I maintain that so long as men keep thinking honestly about the things of the soul and the Church, there are bound to be amazing differences regarding the important matters of our faith—differences even about salvation, and certainly about the best forms of worship and government. Nothing else is possible if we retain honest and individual thinking.

Further, amid so much loose talk of union and the 'scandal of schism', let us be fair enough to admit two indubitable points: First, that every division of the Church has added its peculiar quota to the total contribution of Christian thinking and practice; and, second, that all the diverse forms of Church order and government sprang from passionate ideals of what the Church of Christ should be and what the truth of God is. Our fathers, whose divisions we fashionably deplore, at least cared so deeply for their visions of truth that they did what we seldom do—they suffered for them!

Did they stress non-essentials? That is not the point. The point is that these things seemed so essential to them, concerning not only the 'bene esse,' but the very 'esse', of the Church, that they gladly suffered for their principles. Granted that there was gross bigotry and prejudice. Granted that minor points may have been glorified into major. But is not this merely 'the other side' of intense interest and passion? With all its faults and tragedies, I would much rather have narrowness than laxness.

A FINER UNITY THAN UNION

Further, let us remember that there is a finer unity than formal union. In spite of ancient differences, now crystallised into separate denominations, the one thing an honest observer discovers when he comes into touch with all types of fellow Christians, is not their differences but their likenesses. The differences are there, I admit, and, like all merely external things, they hit the eye first of all. But, however apparent, the differences are more of the form than the essence. Actually, in everything that matters, all men who own allegiance to Christ are of one body and one spirit, one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all.

Yet there is one line of cleavage in our ideas about the Church of Jesus which seems to me to be fairly final and absolute. Until this cleavage is definitely faced and settled, if that is humanly possible, all vague, pious talk about incorporating unions can only be what it is—slushy sentimentalism.

This radical difference is summed up in the two famous slogans: *ubi episcopus, ibi ecclesia* (where the bishop is, there is the Church) and *ubi Christus, ibi ecclesia* (where Christ is, there is the Church). These, no doubt, are ancient battle-cries. But there are still dead men and dead hopes lying strewn around them. So long as these two contrasted ideals of Church polity are strenuously upheld, any talk of 'comprehensive union' is just so many idle words.

CONTRASTED IDEALS

The first stands for some type of mediation or patronage between the grace of God and the ordinary humble member. It states that the Church only exists in and around some Christian of a higher 'order', called the bishop. This is actually the case in all Episcopal Churches. The bishop alone has the right of 'confirming,' 'ordaining,' and 'consecrating'. Any clergyman or priest of a lesser order may teach, train and administer the Sacraments but he cannot confirm, ordain or consecrate. Under the Episcopal polity a group of Christians may meet together for worship, but their edifice is in no sense a 'Church' until the bishop has ordained the incumbent, confirmed the members, and consecrated the building. Literally, it is the bishop, and only the bishop, who makes the Church—*ubi episcopus, ibi ecclesia*.

The second slogan, *ubi Christus, ibi ecclesia*, affirms something wholly different, that wherever a few Christians band themselves together in the Name of Jesus, there is the Church. In other words, the Church is made by its Christian members, and all powers are finally vested in them. If they will, they may choose and set apart special officers for the work of the ministry, but ultimately the being, rights, and privileges of the Church rest with the community of believers.

Now the difference between these two principles is radical. The one government, the Episcopal, is essentially autocratic: the other is fundamentally democratic. In the one, the bishop alone constitutes the people into a Christian Church: in the other, the believers make the Church, and choose their leaders and pastors.

It is on this latter principle of the power and freedom of the people that all non-Episcopal communions throughout Christendom may find a common *fundamentum* on which they may proceed to discuss other minor differences. But I maintain that the absence of this *fundamentum* makes all further talk completely futile.

LIKE WITH LIKE

Any possibility of 'larger union' depends, I am convinced, on the earlier linking of like with like. To begin with, this is easier and more natural; and, secondly, it will give the non-Episcopal Churches a status, and shall we say, a 'bargaining power,' which at present they do not possess. For the final clash and, I hope, *compromise* between the two ancient slogans to which we have referred, it is necessary that both parties should be equally united and strong.

Meanwhile for the nearer union of the non-Episcopal Churches, which at least have no fundamental barriers, I have a suggestion to make. I should like to see a Commission appointed (we are in the age of Commissions) of, say, seven members from each communion. Mix the seven well between younger and older people. Ask these men and women to be wise enough to start with a clean sheet. Let them suppose that the Church of Jesus has no history, but is being organised afresh to meet the peculiar problems and conditions of modern life. What system or combination of systems would they devise, as free as possible from their own prejudices, *were they launching the Church of Christ for the first time?*

For this purpose, certain things must be taken as axiomatic.

1. There is no such thing as a Divine or appointed system of government. Jesus sent His people out into the world to preach, and purposely left the corporate formation or polity of the Church to the wisdom of their Christian experience.

2. No present-day system can claim Divine sanction. Every one is man devised, and its only justification lies in its proved utility. Each one is the slow growth of Christian accommodation, and is all the better of being so. No polity is sacrosanct.

3. Every system must be tested and scrutinised for its practical effectiveness for the ends of the Kingdom, and that alone. Each of them may have proved itself worthy and suitable for its own day and generation. This is admitted. But the question is—is any one of them wholly adequate for the problems of the modern world?

4. Let the Commission collate the advantages and disadvantages of each system as frankly as honest men can, and, if possible, recommend to the Churches a scheme for common effective government. I do not think that this is beyond the power of *Christian* people. It may be that the Churches concerned might reject the scheme. But their refusal might be their own judgment.

5. Let the members of the Commission ask themselves such questions as these:

Are we, Congregationalists, too independent and self-segregated, and would our power and adequacy be increased by more cohesion, a greater responsibility felt for our weaker brethren, and a more centralised authority?

Are we, Presbyterians, too rigid and inelastic in our methods? Would a 'constitutional bishop' (not a 'prelate') be a gain in our system? Do we lay an undue stress on an 'educated ministry', thereby excluding many gifted evangelists, especially excluding gifted laymen?

Are we Methodists, too much the slaves of our own magnificent system? Is a rotational change of ministry best either for the man or the people? If so, should some modified form of it be recommended for all the Churches?

Are we, Baptists, too independent and separatistic, and sometimes too exclusive? Could we not practise whatever may be precious and peculiar to ourselves within a larger and common communion? Should we limit the right of the congregation to call anybody it likes irrespective of the imprimatur of the whole Church?

I should give such a Commission very full Christian liberty. Its findings would of course be 'recommendations,' but I believe that their Christian fairness and broadness would be their finest appeal. I think that if such a body of fair-minded devoted men and women were to issue a scheme for the ordering of the Christian Church for its most effective life and service it would mark a new epoch in an ancient controversy.

Finally, its recommendations would provide a needed basis of discussion for the separate Churches in their appropriate courts. To use a homely phrase, the ball would at least be set a-rolling, which is perhaps the main thing at the present moment.

The Forms by Which We Worship

By SATHIA SAMUEL, Esq., B.A., L.T., Tuticorin

'God is a spirit and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth.' It is immaterial to God whether our prayers are sung or said or read in any position we like—sitting or standing or kneeling or lying or walking. But this is all very well when private individual intercession is concerned; it makes a difference if the worship is of a corporate or public nature. Order is Heaven's first law; the Church is but the reflection of Heaven. Hence some order or form of worship is of paramount importance in our houses of prayer. At this point we are all agreed, but opinion seems sharply divided as to the degree of form our worship should take. But that is to be expected. Your right is my left, if we happen to face opposite ways; and even if we face the same way our angles of vision vary. I stand quite erect; of this I feel no doubt; but I hear a voice from the Antipodes saying 'no—you are wrong; you are hanging head downward from the globe'. Standing at the North Pole one can look only southward; there, there

is neither East nor West. But few there be that can stand at the poles.

After this rigmarole, let me turn to the subject in hand. Where does an Anglican and where does a Presbyterian or Congregational brother stand in the line of public worship? I merely present before you the side of the Anglican form of worship undaunted of course by whispers from the corners 'you are wrong'. I am not a divine, and don't pretend to possess a thorough knowledge of the Book of Common Prayer used in our Churches. I only would tell you how I feel about it myself. To some the Book of Common Prayer may be a red rag. At the outset I would ask such to divest themselves of all prejudices for an open mind is the only gateway leading to the house of understanding and truth. I wonder how many of those who have conceived a prejudice against the Book, have read it or attended our services where the Book is used.

The Church has treasured the Book of Common Prayer—one of the trophies of the Reformation for the procuring of reverence, piety and devotion in the public worship of God. The Prayer Book has a Jewish background, so far as it relates to the form of worship. Time and space do not admit of speaking about the history and tradition of this wonderful Book. Suffice to say that it has like a tree grown up gradually, and it came from a seed, too—a seed planted by the Lord Jesus Himself viz., the Lord's Prayer and the words of consecration which was the earliest form of worship of the early Christian Church as recorded in the New Testament (Acts ii. 42). As the Church was spreading into different countries, different liturgies came into use, great development taking place after the time of Constantine when the fear of persecution was past. In England Services were all in Latin. The Reformation turned them into English, and in 1549 appeared the first English Book of Common Prayer 'clothed in English, the beauty of which has been rarely equalled, and never surpassed, even in the best age of literary excellence'. In compiling a new order of service for the whole realm all that was possible of earlier services which could be traced back to primitive times, was preserved. The preface of the Book of Common Prayer starts with the following sentence: 'it has been the wisdom of the Church of England, ever since the first compiling of public liturgy, to keep the mean between the two extremes, of too much stiffness in refusing, and of too much easiness in admitting any variation from it.' As a matter of fact additions and deletions have since been made as in the revised Prayer Books of 1604 and 1662, to ease the tender conscience of some people. Nothing however, has been admitted which was held to be contrary to the Holy Scriptures.

Now a question may arise—Why should Church people have a Prayer Book at all or, in other words, a set form of prayer? I think we can understand why if we think a little about it. First of all, it is the duty of Christian Church people to pray for every one in the world. If the Clergy in the Church only said prayers in their own words, they could not possibly always remember every one, neither could the congregation. But when they use the Prayer Book Service no one in the whole world is left out. Let me illustrate what I say by a reference to a certain Prayer in Communion Service viz., that for 'Christ's Church militant here in earth' (Here read out the Prayer) 'First we pray for the Holy Catholic Church and for all that do confess Thy Holy name,' that takes in Christians of all denominations—'All Christian Kings, Princes and Governors: all Bishops and Curates'—what a number of people come into that Prayer. Then again 'To all Thy people give Thy Heavenly Grace'—what countless multitudes are reached by that Prayer. Then think what 'all who are in trouble, sorrow, need; sickness or any other adversity' means—the sufferers everywhere in hospitals and asylums: the blind, deaf and dumb, the mourners; the poor and unemployed. There must be millions of them and not one is left out when the Prayer Book Service for Holy Communion is used or when the Litany is used. The end of the Prayer is wider still: it goes to the happy land of Paradise when we remember and thank God for 'all those who have departed this life in His faith and fear'.

There is another reason why a Book of Common Prayer is so precious to Church people. It is a wonderful help to remember what countless people through all the centuries have found its services a help and comfort and what multitudes are saying the Prayers with us now. 'Common prayer'—that is, for all people praying together. The Common Service, for instance, has prayers in it that go back to the time of Apostles, prayers that the early Christians said deep down in the catacombs, that martyrs repeated before they were thrown to the lions or burnt alive: that the first Missionaries taught the half savage Britons.

Another reason why the Book of Common Prayer commends itself to me is its beautiful setting with short comprehensive prayers like the Collects. Let us for example take the form of Morning Service and an analysis of the Matins or Morning Service will disclose all the elements of Christian worship.

1. *Introduction.* A few chosen sentences from the Holy Scriptures, Exhortation, confession and absolution.

2. *Praise and Thanksgiving.* The Lord's Prayer, Versicles, Canticles, Psalms and general thanksgiving.

3. *The Word of God.* The lessons, one from the Old Testament and the other from the New Testament, and the truth confessed in the creed.

4. *Prayer.* The Lord's Prayer, the versicles, the collects, the occasional prayers and the benediction.

It will be noticed that the service opens with the message of God to His people, calling for penitence and promising forgiveness, which is met by the response of confession. Next comes the pronouncement of absolution in God's name, which naturally awakens in the pardoned soul the outburst of praise and thanksgiving in Lord's Prayer, Psalms and Canticles. Before this dies away, the voice of God speaks again in the lessons from His word; and this revelation is accepted by the response of faith in the Creed. Lastly in the sense of His grace and the knowledge of His will, we turn to prayer for ourselves and for others and end with commendation of all to His blessing.

Now, in an extempore prayer service we are at the mercy of a Minister whose vision may be coloured by the happenings of the day, and whose memory, idiosyncrasy, health and varying mood cannot be depended upon in a worship of common prayer. His may be a wearisome prayer, sermon-like and peculiar. True, a good spontaneous prayer has a value of its own, but let me ask what is spontaneous prayer after all except that on analysis it is chiefly a repetition of frequently-heard things.

The Prayer Book is not however intended to supersede all spontaneous utterances of the soul's needs or it can be charged with cramping devotions. Extempore prayers should not be tabooed from our worship of God. No book can meet all our spiritual necessities. Our Prayer Book is a Manual of public prayer and considered from that point of view, its order, its variety, its fixed language are helps and not hindrances. Saying the prayers with the Clergy or alternately, singing them, and the different postures of sitting, kneeling and standing should certainly prevent the worship becoming mechanical. The present Prayer Book drawn up in 1662 in Charles II's time stands in need of a revision. The Church has needs now that were unknown then. For instance, there is no prayer for Missionary Societies like the S.P.C.K. for the obvious reason that the S.P.C.K. is 36 years younger than the Prayer Book; there is also no provision in the prayers for dangers in the aerial service which is of recent origin.

The Book of Common Prayer has so much to commend itself to us that the Uniting Churches may seriously consider if they cannot produce a Book of Common Prayer, suited to the needs and conditions of the Church of India. Thereby no liberty of any one Church will be at stake; on the other hand we shall be joining in unity and concord with the larger band of Christians in common worship which is perfect freedom. The constituent States of America are united into one body politic yet each of them is a free State. Cannot the scattered forces of Christianity rally under the banner of Christ, united in their aim and worship and strengthened to disperse the devil of doubt and disunion and reach the goal of true understanding and fellowship?

This is a challenge to all Christendom, particularly to us who have the privilege to be the pioneers of this great movement towards the union of Churches, in this caste-ridden heathen land.

Book Review

The Buddha and the Christ. An Exploration of the Meaning of the Universe and of the Purpose of Human Life. The Bampton Lectures for 1932. B. H. Streeter. Macmillan. 7s. 6d.

Canon Streeter in his latest book is not attempting a study in comparative religion. He wants rather to investigate what religion can reveal of ultimate reality, and with the help of his investigations to work out a practical philosophy of living. He selects Buddhism and Christianity for his study, as they alone claim to be world religions, apart from Islam, which has nothing to contribute that is not in Christianity. A preliminary chapter on science and religion—one of the most interesting in the book—covers, with different arguments and illustrations, the same thesis as that propounded in *Reality* that science can form no foundation for a materialistic philosophy, in that it deliberately limits itself to a one-aspect, abstracted view of the world, whereas religion, which deals essentially with life and value, is thereby more competent to understand the real nature of the universe. With this underlying assumption and objective the next three chapters go on to describe the ideals and development of the two great religions. In the later half of his work Canon Streeter does not always hold himself strictly by the title of his book, but deals rather with general religious questions such as magic and religion, the problem of pain, and immortality. The thought climax of the volume comes in between the chapters on the latter two subjects, in a chapter in which the working

maxim 'Live constructively' is propounded, defended, and based on the general argument.

This will not rank as one of Canon Streeter's greater books. At the same time there is much in it that is extremely suggestive and helpful. There is a section in Chapter V on 'The Image of God', to which many readers will turn again and again. It is wonderfully clear, where men are so often confused, and as a result it strikes home. Indeed the whole book is a model of clarity without hardness, and of deep religious insight with no trace of sentimentality. Add to this some delightful touches of humour, and we have the ingredients that provide profit and stimulus in whatever book of his we may read.

H. K. MOULTON.

AT THE LEADING SURGICAL HOUSE!

"SURGICO"



RELIABLE

PRECISION THERMOMETERS, made of special *Normal-Glass*, triangular magnifying lenses and clear, distinct and easily readable black figures. Self-registering in $\frac{1}{3}$ minute. 'Shakedown' easily. Passed the most exacting and severe tests. Sold with a printed guarantee as to *accuracy* and *reliability*. Used in several hospitals in India. In Nickel case, As. **14** each. Rs. **10** per dozen. In screwed coloured Vulcanite cases, Re. **1-4** each, Rs. **14-4** per dozen: both with pocket clips.



"SR" Adhesive Plasters. Zinc Oxide. In airtight containers. Very useful and lasting quality. Pocket or trunk size. For cuts, wounds, etc. In spools 5 yards long.

Width, $\frac{1}{2}$, 1, $1\frac{1}{2}$, 2, 3 ins.
Rs. 7-8, 9, 12, 15, 21 doz.

Hospital Size Rolls. 12 inches wide, 5 yards long.
Rs. 5-8 each.

Physician or Household Size Rolls. One yard long, 7 inches wide, Re. 1-8 each.

Superior Quality
and Self-Adhesive.

Goodrich Hot Water Bottles. Best for the Indian climate. Long-lasting, durable and fast-selling Rubber Bottle in the world.

2 quarts Rs. 3-4 each.

3 " Rs. 3-8 each.

Do. with Douche Combined, complete. 2 quarts, Rs. 5-8 each.

Infants' or Face Hot Water Bottle, 1 pint, Rs. 2-4.

Ice Cap, oval ... Rs. 2-4

Ice Cap, round ... Rs. 2-4

Throat and Spinal

Icebag ... Rs. 3-8

Special Goodrich list sent post free.



Our New Catalogue of Surgical Instruments & Hospital Requisites Now Available

Manufacturers of Hernia Trusses, Abdominal Belts and Orthopedic Appliances

BOMBAY SURGICAL CO., New Charni Road, BOMBAY, 4.

Telegrams: 'SURGICO'

Telephone No. 41936

THOS. COOK & SON, LTD.

(INCORPORATED IN ENGLAND.)

IN CO-OPERATION WITH

WAGONS=LITS CO.

Head Office :—Berkeley Street, Piccadilly, LONDON, W. I.

PASSAGES engaged by all lines at same fares as charged by Steamship Companies. Holders of COOK'S tickets met at all ports. Outward passages engaged and tickets supplied from any part of the World to India. Usual reductions obtained for Missionaries, Railway Officials, Families, etc.

BAGGAGE received, stored and forwarded. Cargo shipped to all parts of the World at current rates. Inward consignments such as Hardware, Piecegoods, Machinery, Stores, etc., for Messes and Clubs, cleared and forwarded at special rates. Insurances of all kinds effected on Baggage, Cargo, Livestock, Mess Property, etc.

THE ORIENTAL TRAVELLERS' GAZETTE containing sailing dates and fares of all steamers, together with invaluable information for travellers, sent post free on application.

GOVERNMENT CERTIFICATES accepted. No deposit required.

THOS. COOK & SON (BANKERS), LTD.

(INCORPORATED IN ENGLAND.)

Head Office :—Berkeley Street, Piccadilly, LONDON, W. I.

CURRENT AND FIXED DEPOSIT ACCOUNTS opened. Interest allowed. Pay and Pensions collected. Periodical remittances made at current rates. Insurances premia paid.

LETTERS OF CREDIT AND TRAVELLERS' CHEQUES issued, encashable throughout the World.

DRAFTS granted and TELEGRAPHIC TRANSFERS effected on all principal towns.

INSURANCE Life, Accident, Fire, Burglary, effected. Prospectus on application.

300 Offices throughout the World.

**EASTERN OFFICES: BAGHDAD, BOMBAY, CALCUTTA,
COLOMBO, DELHI, MADRAS, RANGOON, SIMLA, and
SINGAPORE.**

Madras Office

1-35 Mount Road.

Telegraphic Address: "COUPON"